

others and there is kind of a standard that is set. If you have the Government coming in for the sake of politicians and just setting an automatic raise, you sort of disrupt all of that process.

It also gives the employee the idea that this is all I am going to make, so we take away the incentive that they have for improving themselves, which the minimum wage, as it stands right now as a starting wage, as a training wage, is in fact an indicator or a starting place for the employees.

So what I am really saying is no employer really wants his employees to stay on minimum wage. If they stay on minimum wage and they think that is all they are going to get until the politicians come and help them, they will not be committed to productivity, they will not be committed to improvement or achievement, and they will just sit there. When that happens, there is a staleness that takes place, and those employees that want to stay on minimum wage and they figure that is all they are going to do eventually need to be moved off the work force, because they are not responsive to the customer. Again, the customer is the king. He is the boss, and they are the people we are trying to please.

There is also the employee who is remaining when the cutbacks come. They have to work under more stress and confusion, and that hinders and hurts the operations.

Now, if you think through all of that and you assume all of that for the sake of this discussion as being true, coming from someone who is actually in the pits of working with consumers and with employees and trying to deal with all these forces, if those things are true, then what you have is a question of why in the world then do we do it?

I have finally concluded that the liberals, the liberal politicians, are using this as a front, using the emotionalism of this issue as a front to charge more taxes, to take more money away from businesses, and that is wrong also. That has an effect.

So these are the reasons for my being against raising the minimum wage.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. MONTGOMERY] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. MONTGOMERY addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. WALKER addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FOX] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. METCALF] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. METCALF addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. NEUMANN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. NEUMANN addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MCINTOSH] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. MCINTOSH addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

#### THE CIVILITY PLEDGE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BLUTE] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BLUTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the subject of my special order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLUTE. Mr. Speaker, we tonight gather for a special order of a different kind, not like many of the ones that deal with substantive issues that we hear every day here in this Chamber of the people's House of Representatives. Tonight we are going to deal with an issue that I think is very important with how we conduct our business here in the House of Representatives, and that is on the civility of the House debate as it has evolved over the course of our history, but also as it has evolved within recent years, which has caused many of us to be very troubled with the nature of the discourse here in the House of Representatives.

We are being joined with Members from both parties, in both the Democratic Party, the Coalition, and also with the Mainstream Alliance of which we are Members on the Republican side, Members who are commonly referred to as Blue Dogs, Blue Dog Democrats and Blue Dog Republicans, joining here together to talk about an issue that we think is very important, that we think the American people should understand why it is so impor-

tant that we conduct our business here, conduct our debates, in a way that brings credit upon us and upon this institution.

Thomas Jefferson once remarked that it was very material that ordered, decency and regularity be preserved in a dignified public body. Frankly, there have been too many incidents here in our body over the last few years that have brought, I think, discredit on the membership of this body and further eroded the public's confidence in the way we conduct our business.

After all, we pass the laws that the people have to live up to. If they do not respect the institution, then it becomes more difficult for them to respect the laws that we ultimately pass, which they think is very important.

Certainly some of the incivility we have seen in the House of Representatives and in our political cultures relates and emanates from the general society's growing trend toward incivility, toward lack of respect for one another. U.S. News & World Report had a cover story called "In Your Face, Whatever Happened to Good Manners?"

So we are a reflection of the larger society. We think it is important that we be responsible and address our own problem in this area. We think that by doing this, we can improve this institution's reputation with the American people.

We have authored, the Blue Dogs jointly, Democrats and Republicans, a civility pledge that some of the Members will talk about later, but basically it commits Members of the House of Representatives to treating each other in a respectful manner during our differences of opinion. We believe that one can have tremendous disagreements, that one can have a vigorous debate on the issues that our great country faces, the divisive issues we face, without the type of acrimony and the type of personal invective that we see all too often in this House.

We are making the effort tonight, we have been doing it for a couple of months, we have over 70 cosponsors, but we wanted to have this special order to bring focus to this issue, to try to get more support within the House for this effort, and we think ultimately if we are successful, we are going to return this body to the place where it really should be, the people's House, where we can disagree without being disagreeable.

At this time I would like to yield to someone who is a great leader of this House, he is someone who in his day-to-day conduct represents the kind of civility we are talking about, and that is the chairman of the Subcommittee on Energy and Power of the Committee on Commerce, Congressman DAN SCHAEFER from Colorado.

Mr. SCHAEFER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman very much for giving me this opportunity to speak to this body and to the American people very briefly on exactly what it is we are doing.